



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,577	06/14/2001	Dennis Heaton	11098-004	5864

7590 10/27/2003

Steven L. Oberholtzer
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, IL 60610

EXAMINER

TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,577

Applicant(s)

HEATON, DENNIS

Examiner

LeChi Truong

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As to claim 2, the term “ sending a password request from the first computer to the second computer” was not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al (US. 6,151,020).

As to claim 1, Palmer teaches a distributed computer network (distributed computing, col 1, ln 10-25), a first computer (a server 10, col 2, ln 55-67/col 3, n 1067/ col 4, ln 1-25/col 5, ln 27-38/ col 8, ln 1-5/ln 30-67), a first data display device (a display screen 11, col 2, ln 55-67/col 3, ln 10-67/ col 4, ln 1-25/col 5, ln 27-38/ln 30-67), a second computer (the client A 12 / client B 14, col 2, ln 55-67/col 3, n 1067/ col 4, ln 1-25/col 5, ln 27-38/ln 30-67), a communication link (the conventional computer network, col 2, ln 55-67), data/ the same data(a shared cursor 25, col 3, ln 1-67/ bit maps of information , col 5, n 27-38), real time(real time, col 1, ln 10-25). Palmer does not explicit teach the term first and second storage medium. However, Palmer teaches first / second data storage medium (the share region 18/ shared application window 24/28, col 2, ln 55-67/col 3, ln 10-67/ col 4, ln 1-25/col 5, ln 27-38/ln 30-67). It would have been obvious to apply

Art Unit: 2126

the teaching of Palmer for the purpose of the storage in order to store the information that will be displayed in both server and client.

2. Claims 2,3,4, 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al (US. 6,151,020) in view of Araki (method for authenticating information receiving person)

As to claim 2, Palmer teaches a retrieval request (the audio information 34/40, col 3, ln 1- 67/ pixel format, col 8, ln 30-67).

Palmer does not explicit teach the password request, authentication the password. However, Araki teaches password, authenticate (page 1-2).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jang to Palmer in order authentication a client being an information receiving person in a client server type system.

As to claim 3, Palmer teaches performed prior to said retrieving step (the information 34/ 40 is passed from client to server...audio information is passed from server to client, col 3, ln 1- 67).

As to claim 4, Palmer does not explicit teach the term receiving a retrieval request occurs prior to said step of sending a password request. However, Araki teaches a CGI script and an html are requested to a server 1 (page 1).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jang to Palmer in order authentication a client being an information receiving person in a client server type system.

As to claim 5, Palmer does not explicit teach the term receiving a retrieval request occurs after said step of sending a password request. However, Araki teaches a call from client to the server (page 1-2).

Art Unit: 2126

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Jang to Palmer in order authentication a client being an information receiving person in a client server type system.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmer et al (US. 6,151,020) in view of APA (Admitted Prior Art).

As to claim 6, Palmer does not teach medical data. However, APA teaches medical instrumentation (page 1, ln 1-10).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of APA to Palmer in order to make the distributed computer systems that allow remote monitoring of events occurring on another computer more available to use in various areas.

4. *Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

LeChi Truong
October 14, 2003

 JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100